

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of July 9, 2007, the drawings were objected to because Fig. 1 includes rectangular boxes without labels and Fig. 2 is not designated as “prior art”. In addition, the title of the invention was objected to because it is allegedly not descriptive. Furthermore, it is alleged that the application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure.

In response, with respect to the objections to the drawings, Applicants hereby submit a replacement sheet of drawings for Figs. 1 and 2. In the replacement sheet of drawings, labels have been added to the rectangular boxes in Fig. 1 and a legend of “Prior Art” has been added to Fig. 2. With respect to the objection to the title, Applicants respectfully assert that the current title of the invention is descriptive of the invention to which the claims are directed. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the title be withdrawn. With respect to the abstract of the disclosure, Applicants have amended the current abstract so that an amended abstract commences on a separate page.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0189537 A1 (hereinafter “Yun”). In addition, claims 4-6, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yun in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,635 (hereinafter “Takahara et al.”) and/or U.S. Patent No. 5,253,091 (hereinafter “Kimura et al.”).

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claim 1 and added a new independent claim 11 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Yun, Takahara et al. and Kimura et al. Applicants have also canceled claims 4-6, amended claims 7 and 9, and added new claims 10 and 12-17. As explained below, the amended independent claim 1 and the new independent claim 11 are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references of Yun, Takahara et al. and Kimura et al. In view of the claim amendments and the following

remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the independent claims 1 and 11, as well as their dependent claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 12-17, be allowed.

A. Patentability of Independent Claims 1 and 11

5

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites in part “*some of the control lines being connected to a plurality of delay units such that only every other control line is connected to a particular delay unit, the delay units being used to store row voltage values for the control lines connected to the delay units until a clock signal is supplied* to the delay units,” which is not disclosed in any of the cited references of Yun, Takahara et al. and Kimura et al.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

None of the cited references of cited references of Yun, Takahara et al. and Kimura et al. disclose “*a plurality of delay units*” that are connected to “*some of the control lines*” such that “*only every other control line is connected to a particular delay unit*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Yun. Furthermore, since none of these cited references disclose such “*delay units*,” the cited references even when combined do not teach all the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Consequently, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of these cited references. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

30

The above remarks are also applicable to the new independent claim 11, which recite similar limitations as the amended independent claim 1. In particular, the new independent claim recites in part “*some of the data lines being connected to a plurality of delay units such that only every other data line is connected to a*

*particular delay unit, the delay units being used to store column voltage values for the data lines connected to the delay units until a clock signal is supplied to the delay units,”* which is not disclosed in any of the cited references of Yun, Takahara et al. and Kimura et al. Thus, the new independent claim 11 is also neither anticipated nor obvious in view of these cited references.

**B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 12-17**

Each of the dependent claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 12-17 depends on one of the independent claims 1 and 11. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kieschnick et al.

Date: October 9, 2007

By: /thomas h. ham/  
Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300